

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARTIN J. SALCEDO,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHASTA COUNTY SHERIFF, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:19-cv-2627-EFB P

ORDER


Plaintiff is a county jail inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 10, 2020, the court screened plaintiff's complaint and determined that it stated cognizable claims of excessive force and retaliation against defendants Cortez and Rabone. ECF No. 13. The court noted that plaintiff had also improperly listed "Shasta County Sheriffs" as a defendant and informed plaintiff that if he could identify specific additional individuals against whom he wished to assert claims, he could file a motion to amend, *along with a proposed amended complaint* for the court's review. *Id.* at 2 n.1; *see also* E.D. Cal. Local Rule 220 (requiring that motions to amend be accompanied by a proposed amended complaint that is rewritten or retyped so that it is complete in itself without reference to any earlier filed complaint).

////

1 Plaintiff now moves to amend his complaint to add eight individual defendants but has not  
2 submitted a proposed amended complaint for the court's review. ECF No. 15. Without a  
3 proposed amended complaint, the court cannot conduct the screening required by 28 U.S.C.  
4 § 1915A to determine whether plaintiff has stated any additional claims against the defendants he  
5 wishes to add.

6 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to amend (ECF No. 15) is denied  
7 without prejudice for failure to comply with the court's order and Local Rule 220.

8 DATED: May 4, 2020.

9   
10 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28